

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/066,542	02/05/2002	Osamu Nakamura	740756-2431	5042	
22204	7590 01/13/2006		EXAMINER		
NIXON PEABODY, LLP 401 9TH STREET, NW			JACKSON JR, JEROME		
SUITE 900			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20004-2128		2815		
			DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/066,542	NAKAMURA ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Jerome Jackson Jr.	2815	
The MAILING Period for Reply	G DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	dress
WHICHEVER IS LC - Extensions of time may after SIX (6) MONTHS fi - If NO period for reply is a Failure to reply within the Any reply received by the	TATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL'DNGER, FROM THE MAILING Does available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 from the mailing date of this communication. Specified above, the maximum statutory period of the set or extended period for reply will, by statute the Office later than three months after the mailing stment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this co IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,
Status				
1) Responsive t	o communication(s) filed on 07 N	ovember 2005.		
2a) ☐ This action is		action is non-final.		
3) Since this ap	plication is in condition for allowa		rosecution as to the	merits is
·	ordance with the practice under E	•		
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) <u>1,3-</u>	6,8-13,15-18,20-23,25-27 and 41	-56 is/are pending in the applica	ition.	
	ove claim(s) is/are withdra			
	6,8-13,15-18,20-22,25-27 and 41			
	and 45-56 is/are rejected.			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is/are objected to.			
· · ·	are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specificat	ion is objected to by the Examine	r.		
·	s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.	
	not request that any objection to the	•		
Replacement of	drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	bjected to. See 37 CF	R 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or d	eclaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PT	O-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119			
-	ent is made of a claim for foreign Some * c)⊡ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1.☐ Certifie	ed copies of the priority document	s have been received.		
2. Certifie	ed copies of the priority document	s have been received in Applica	tion No	
3 Copies	of the certified copies of the prio	rity documents have been receiv	ved in this National	Stage
applica	ition from the International Bureau	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attach	ed detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ved.	
Attachment(s)		_		
1) Notice of References		4) Interview Summar		
	's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) • Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·)-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/066,542

Art Unit: 2815

Claims 1,3-6,8-13,15-18,20-22 and 41-44 are allowed.

Applicant's arguments filed 10/11/05 regarding these claims are convincing of patentability. Henley's "first portion" would include the gettering atom region which has a lower crystallinity than the "second portion" without the gettering atoms. Thus the Henley structure would not meet the claim 1 structure.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 23,25-27,45-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Henley, of record.

The previous rejection still applies. There are no recitations in claim 23 of a channel region containing the gradient and first and second portions as in allowed claims above. The semiconductor layer of Henley meets the claimed semiconductor layer structure as previously stated. Claim 45 likewise is rejected as there are no recitations the channel region contains first and second portions as in the allowed claims. Figure 8 of Henley shows a gate structure 803 with two layers, presumably the bottom layer being a gate insulating film. In the event applicant argues that the bottom layer is not a gate insulating film, such would be considered a completely obvious design for a FET structure as Henley as insulated gate electrodes enable low gate leakage current among numerous other advantages, are widely practiced in the art and take the name "MOSFET" or "MISFET". Top or Bottom gate design is also considered obvious routine design to one of ordinary skill and would not be considered a patentable distinction over Henley without unexpected results. Claims 49 and 53 are similar to

claim 45 and likewise rejected. Dependent claims as stated previously recite obvious applications of thin film FET devices and are not considered by themselves patentable additions to the independent claims.

Claims 23,25-27,45-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henley in view of Wu '833.

In regard to FET design with insulated gates, Wu shows and suggests insulated gate design with SiN insulator. Moreover, Wu suggests bottom gate design for the advantage of removing the semiconductor layer away from the glass substrate. See the backround of the invention. It would have been obvious to have practiced a thin film semiconductor layer as Henley with rare atom gettering sites to improve the semiconductor layer quality and further to have practiced bottom insulated gate design from Wu to improve FET device performance and use an advantageous two step mask process. Applicant's claims are obvious structure. Claims 49 and 53 are similar to rejected claim 23 and likewise rejected.

Applicant's arguments filed 10/11/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for all claims. As stated above, arguments related to allowed claims are persuasive. Regarding rejected claim 23, there is no recitation of "channel region" with first and second portions as in allowed claim 1. Henley shows a semiconductor layer with a first portion containing rare gas gettering atoms and other portions above and below the first portion without rare gas atoms. The other portions have higher crystallinity as they do not contain the rare gas atoms. Accordingly claim 23 is rejected.

Art Unit: 2815

In regard to claim 45, the new rejection including Wu shows gate insulators and bottom gate design to be advantageous and obvious to practice with SOI including rare gas gettering portions as in Henley.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Jackson Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-1730. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on 571-272-1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jj

JEROME JACKSON PRIMARY EXAMINER